

REMARKS

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 19-21 have been amended. Claims 16-18 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-15 and 19-21 remain pending in the present Application. In view of the above-noted amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-9 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a method of automatically updating inventory data in an inventory management system, the method comprising “in a computer software application, requesting, *using a user interface of the inventory management system*, a plurality of inventory models from the inventory management system, the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network...selecting, *using the user interface of the inventory management system*, at least one model from the plurality of requested inventory models; generating, *using the user interface of the inventory management system*, an inventory update form for each of the plurality of inventory models in the software application program; automatically populating each inventory update form with updated inventory data in the software application program, the updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system; and sending, *using the user interface of the inventory management system*, the updated inventory data from the software application program to the inventory management system.” (Emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the amendment to claim 1 ties the limitations of claim 1 to a product and therefore overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Claims

2-9 and 19 depend from and therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1 and are therefore also tied to the product to which claim 1 is tied. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 2-9 and 19 are also allowable over the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Claim 20 depends from independent claim 10, which is a system claim. It is respectfully submitted that the limitations of claim 20 are tied to the system of claim 10 and are therefore not subject to a 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-15 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,216,612 to Cornett et al. (hereinafter “Cornett”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,990 to Vogler et al. (hereinafter “Vogler”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,300 to Brockman (hereinafter “Brockman”). (See 9/2/09 Office Action, pp. 3-17.)

Amended claim 1 recites “[a] method of *automatically updating inventory data in an inventory management system*, the method comprising: in a computer software application, requesting, using a user interface of the inventory management system, a plurality of inventory models from the inventory management system, *the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment*; selecting, using the user interface of the inventory management system, at least one model from the plurality of requested inventory models; generating, using the user interface of the inventory management system, an inventory update form for each of the plurality of inventory models in the software application program; *automatically populating each inventory update form with updated inventory data in the software application program, the updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management*

system; and sending, using the user interface of the inventory management system, the updated inventory data from the software application program to the inventory management system.” (Emphasis Added).

It is respectfully submitted that neither Cornett nor Vogler nor Brockman teach or suggest the limitation of “in a computer software application, requesting, using a user interface of the inventory management system, a plurality of inventory models from the inventory management system, *the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment,*” as recited in claim 1. In the Non-Final Office Action of September 2, 2009, the Examiner concedes that “[t]he combination of Cornett and Vogler do not explicitly disclose that the method having ... ‘the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for a central office in a telecommunications network’ ... ‘the updated inventory data comprising specific operating parameters for the inventoried equipment in the inventory management system’.” (See 9/2/09 Office Action, p. 13). The Examiner goes on to cite Brockman in support of the recited limitation. (*Id.* at p. 17). However, it is respectfully submitted that Brockman also does not teach the above-recited limitation of claim 1. Rather, Brockman is directed to a system for determining that certain products are present in inventory and arranging for the products to be picked from the consignment warehouse 350. (See Brockman, col. 3, ll. 45-67.) The system of Brockman is also directed to inventory values that signify the amount of inventory at a particular distribution center. (*Id.*) Brockman does not teach or suggest any arrangement wherein “*the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment,*” as recited in claim 1 since nothing in Brockman is described as capable of affecting the way that the inventoried products operate. It is further noted that Brockman is inherently incapable of meeting this limitation since all embodiments of Brockman merely pertain to counting what

products are inventoried at the various remote locations. (See Brockman, col. 1, ll. 26-42; col. 3, ll. 35 - col. 4, li. 16; col. 6, ll. 15-29).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that neither Cornett nor Vogler nor Brockman, taken individually or in any combination, teach or suggest the limitation of “in a computer software application, requesting, using a user interface of the inventory management system, a plurality of inventory models from the inventory management system, *the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment,*” as recited in claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore in condition for allowance. Because claims 2-9 and 19 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended claim 10 recites limitations substantially similar to claim 1, including “[a] computer system for automatically updating inventory data, the computer system comprising: *a remote computer in the computer system for storing a database comprising inventory model data, the inventory model data comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment of a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment.*” It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over Cornett, Vogler and Brockman, taken alone or in any combination for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Because claims 11, 12 and 20 depend from, and, therefore, include all of the limitations of claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended claim 13 also recites limitations substantially similar to claim 1, including “[a] system for automatically updating inventory data in an inventory management database, the

system comprising: a client computer; a remote computer; a network connection between the local computer and the remote computer allowing data transfer therebetween; wherein the remote computer comprises: *an inventory management database for storing inventory model data, the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment.*” It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over Cornett, Vogler and Brockman, taken alone or in any combination for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Because claim 14 depends from, and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of claim 13, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.


Amended claim 15 also recites limitations substantially similar to claim 1, including “[a] computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions, which when executed by a computer, cause the computer to perform the steps of: requesting a plurality of inventory models from an inventory management system, *the plurality of inventory models comprising default configuration data for telecommunications equipment in a central office in a telecommunications network, wherein the default configuration data comprises a cabling assignment for wiring between at least two pieces of central office equipment.*” It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over Cornett, Vogler and Brockman, taken alone or in any combination for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. Because claim 21 depends from, and, therefore, includes all of the limitations of claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 2, 2009

By: 
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel.: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276